

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8 and 12, which are independent, are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed and specifically at pages 37-38. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,745,102 to Bloch et al. (hereinafter, merely “Bloch”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,476,817 to Harper et al. (hereinafter, merely “Harper”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,200,597 to Grizzard (hereinafter, merely “Grizzard”).

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“... an extracting section for extracting, from said metadata stored on said storage medium, display data to be displayed in said information display area and for generating a metadata extraction window; and

wherein the extraction section performs automatic extraction in accordance with a preset extraction condition and manual extraction in accordance with a selective instruction;

an information display unit for displaying the extracted display data and the metadata extraction window onto said information display area,

wherein the information display unit displays user-selectable metadata in the metadata extraction window.” (Emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Bloch relates to an apparatus for displaying filename information on a floppy disk. The apparatus utilizes a modified floppy disk housing and a modified floppy disk drive to automatically label the floppy disk with the filenames being copied to or deleted from the disk.

As understood by Applicants, Harper relates to removable data storage media as used with, for example, computers and other data-processing devices, such as floppy disks.

As understood by Applicants, Grizzard relates to graphic search initiation.

Applicants submit that neither Bloch nor Harper nor Grizzard, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the above identified features of claim 1. Specifically, neither of the references used as a basis for rejection describe an extracting section for extracting, from said metadata stored on said storage medium wherein the extraction section performs automatic extraction in accordance with a preset extraction condition and manual extraction in accordance with a selective instruction, display data to be displayed in said information display area and for

generating a metadata extraction window; and an information display unit for displaying the extracted display data and the metadata extraction window onto said information display area, **wherein the information display unit displays user-selectable metadata in the metadata extraction window**, as recited in claim 1.

Specifically, the Office Action concedes that the combination of Bloch and Harper fail to teach or suggest generating a metadata extraction window. Indeed the Office Action relies on Grizzard to provide a description of metadata extraction. However, Applicants submit that the metadata extraction described in Grizzard relates to a pop-up window having a list of options related to an image (306) and its associated metadata (302). (See Grizzard col. 4, lines 44-50 and Figures 3 and 4) Thus, the display of metadata in Grizzard is based on the associated image data and does not have any automatic extraction based on a preset condition and a manual extraction process. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Grizzard describes associating an image with metadata and fails to teach or suggest that **the extraction section performs automatic extraction in accordance with a preset extraction condition and manual extraction in accordance with a selective instruction**, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to, or somewhat similar to, those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 8 and 12 are also patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the

invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of the statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By: 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800